

Examiners' Report
January 2013

GCE History 6HI02 D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.

ResultsPlus

Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education.

Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code US034636

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from many candidates in this examination series. Indeed, many candidates wrote with understanding and insight about the key themes.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in 80 minutes. Examiners commented on the fact that, in this series, many candidates had clearly used their time to very good effect. Although some responses were quite brief, there was little evidence of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

There was a wide range of responses across the mark range, but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched whilst the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination.

In part A, most candidates were able to use the language of cross-referencing, but a significant number often matched statements that showed a comparison for agree or disagree and did not explain or draw out the inferences that are necessary to develop a cross-reference. In part B, it was again disappointing to note that a significant minority of candidates relied very heavily on the material in the sources, which was not always securely understood. Centres are reminded that candidates are expected to have a reasonable range and depth of knowledge that can be applied to the part B questions. Despite comments in previous examiners' reports, many candidates continue to comment on provenance in their responses to part B. Such comments are often very generic e.g. "the historian can be trusted because they have the benefit of hindsight" or "they cannot be trusted because they were not an eye witness to the event". Such comments, even if well developed, generally do not contribute to AO2b, which is being tested in question B. Candidates would do well to develop their arguments in relation to the question, rather than to write whole paragraphs on provenance which can earn no credit under AO2b.

Candidates should take care that they can spell technical words correctly, especially when those words form part of the question or the sources. Some candidates over used words such as 'inference' and did not have a secure understanding of the meaning. Overall, however, the language used by candidates seemed to contain fewer colloquialisms and abbreviations this year than in previous examinations.

The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Question 1 (a)

There were a number of effective answers to this question in which candidates demonstrated that they were able to cross-reference the arguments of the sources convincingly whilst considering aspects of provenance in order to reach measured judgements. Most candidates handled Source 1 well with the stronger responses using it particularly effectively. Weaker responses struggled to demonstrate understanding of the message of Source 3 and the significance of the fact that it was written by a Liberal Unionist. It was pleasing, however, to note that most candidates understood the

requirements of the question even if their answers were sometimes imperfectly executed. A significant issue remains that many candidates did not develop the cross-referencing sufficiently and ignored the provenance beyond the most cursory mention.

(a) Source 1, spoken by Parnell, describes how the Irish Nationalists will attempt to 'calm the fear' of those protestants in the North, and blame that fear on the 'English political parties', a Nationalist view point, ~~which contradicts the Unionist opinion in Source 2 which describes how this fear is because of one Nationalist party, and in~~ Source 2 explains how the founders of the Nationalist party have been 'taught... to hate everything English', and how it is the Irish Nationalists who are hostile: 'An Irish Parliament will have full power to give effect to their hostility'. These two Sources contradict as Parnell blames Unionist fear on the English, whereas Source 2 implies that the fear is because of the Irish Nationalist party rather than the English with whom the Unionists want to keep an alliance. Source 3 shows that Parnell will accept Gladstone's proposals, and describes how the Nationalist party will compromise 'restrictions on her [Ireland's] political liberty', which, although as the source states, 'inconsistent with with

(a) continued their principle of Nationality; does explain how Parnell was ~~of~~ balancing between parties. According to Sources 1 and 3, Parnell does not understand, nor is he willing to understand, the position of the Unionists ^{and} ~~and~~ ^{but} ~~and~~ as he accepts Gladstone's ideas on Home Rule, which will keep Ireland loyal to the crown even if it will allow a degree of autonomy for Ireland. These two sources support the claim that divisions between Nationalist and Unionist were beyond repair ~~before~~ by the time of debates on the first Home Rule Bill, Parnell twists his words in Source 1 to blame Unionist 'fear' of an English when that is not the case, and is accepting of the first Home Rule Bill, which, according to Source 3, goes against his nationalist ideals. Source 2, which opposes Home Rule, describes how the having Home Rule will 'give effect to the [Irish party's] hostility'. All three sources show different viewpoints, even though Source 1 is a nationalist opinion and sources 2 & 3 are Unionist. Source 1, although shows how Parnell does not understand the Unionists, does show how he is attempting to unite Ireland. ~~by~~ ^{through} the content of Source 1.

(a) continued agrees with the statement, that relations were beyond repair, it does show Parnell attempting to fix them. Score 1 agrees to this extent. Score 2 and also agrees completely with the statement and Score 3 agrees to the extent that the Nationalists are already accepting Home Rule without any discussion with the Unionists.

In conclusion, score 1 agrees with the statement to an extent, and scores 2 and 3 completely agree.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good example of an answer that is doing just enough to access level 3. The answer attempts to engage in some cross-referencing, but it is not developed in a sustained way and is not always fully supported. There is some mention of provenance, but this needs to be developed much more fully.

Question 1 (b) (i)

This was marginally the less popular of the two questions set in this option. The weaker responses paraphrased the sources, with no real development of an argument and counter argument. They often approached the answer by working through the sources in sequence with no sustained attempt to draw on more than one source at a time. Any own knowledge that was brought to support this approach was very generic indeed.

However, stronger answers used the sources to create an argument, and were able to integrate this with specific and detailed knowledge to place the response securely in the context of events that were taking place in the pre-war period. Most candidates were able to comprehend all of the sources, but stronger answers were often characterised by their ability to make full use of Source 6.

It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

* (b) (i) Score 4, an extract from a history book, describes how 'civil war was nearly inevitable'. I agree with this statement because of the power of the UVF opposing the Irish volunteers. Source 4 also describes the failure of the Nationalists to compromise on the issue of Home Rule, 'separate parliament for the whole of Ireland', even when Unionists and Nationalists are on the brink of a civil war. Curragh mutiny showed how the British army was not prepared to fight Ulster and source 1 suggests British involvement on the Unionist side. Source 5 suggests that the Asquith thought the Unionists were bluffing, which I think is unlikely given the amount of rifles and other weapons delivered to Ulster and the UVF, in preparation for a fight. Source 6 describes how the 'danger is grossly exaggerated' with reference to the UVF. However, this source was written by a nationalist MP from Ulster, who may be smuggling off the

idea that the Unionists will fight to oppose Home Rule. The source attempts to shrink the prospect of the UVF, even when it describes how Home Rules will be the target of an outbreak

(b) continued I would disagree with Asquith's view ^{in source 5} that the Unionists were bluffing, as the UVF and the Irish Volunteers, the latter created to protect Ireland from the former, were armed, trained and facing each other. I think the chances of the Unionists bluffing were minimal. Source 5 also describes cracks in Ulster's leadership, however, this would not have stopped Ulster fighting Home Rule into civil war. Source 6, which implies that the Nationalists were not concerned by the UVF, even though despite the creation of the Irish volunteers shows how the Nationalist movement was unwilling to recognize that Ulster would fight Home Rule, in my opinion, a naive approach. I completely agree with Source 4. This is because I also agree that civil war was almost inevitable between Unionists and Nationalists, because of previous failures to compromise over Home Rule Bills, and Ulster, who consistently explained it would use force against Home Rule, is at breaking point. The UVF and the Irish Volunteers are ready to fight one another at the word 'go' and the UVF had boatloads of weapons and ammunition delivered to Ulster, to prove

(b) continued that there would be a war if Home Rule was imposed. Members of the British army had refused to fight Ulster, and under Curragh mutiny, had left the army for this reason. Sources 5 and 6 largely underestimate the means that Ulster was willing to go to oppose Home Rule, another factor as to why civil war was inevitable. Despite the formation of the Irish Volunteers, the Nationalists refused to acknowledge that Ulster was a threat, when they underestimated them. Sources 5 and 6 suggest that civil war was not inevitable because of this reason. Source 5 implies Ulster is bluffing and source 6 degrades the power of Ulster and laughs that anybody outside of Belfast should take it seriously, still refusing to consider Ulster as an opponent of the Nationalists. Overall, I agree with the view that by autumn 1914, civil war was inevitable because of how the Unionists & Nationalists were polar opposites and could not compromise on Home Rule, as well as the formation of the UVF and the Irish Volunteers. I disagree with Sources 5 and 6 which describe how Ulster is not a threat.

(b) continued because I think that water have proven time and time again how they will fight if Home Rule is imposed. In conclusion, I agree with the statement and source 4, but disagree with the contrasting opinions expressed in sources 5 and 6.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response achieves a secure level 3 in AO2. It uses the sources as the basis of its argument and clearly understands that there is a debate that needs to be discussed in the sources. It also reaches level 3 in AO1, but slightly less securely. It integrates the sources with contextual own knowledge to create an argument in response to the question, but needs to try to make that knowledge more specific and detailed to move upwards within the level.

Question 1 (b) (ii)

This was marginally the more popular of the two questions set in this option. Some weaker candidates, prompted by Source 7, engaged in some quite detailed description of the events of the Easter Rising. Weaker answers also tended to focus on the evidence that supported the view in the question and were quite limited in any attempts to present a counter argument.

The biggest issue evident in such answers was the lack of candidates' own knowledge and a resulting over-reliance on the sources; however, the vast majority of candidates avoided this trap and there were some excellent and assured high-scoring answers which demonstrated impressive command of the subject material and real cogency of argument. Such answers often picked up on fairly fine detail in the sources, such as the reference to opposition to conscription in both the north and the south in Source 8, and were able to use this to argue the question.

It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and to incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

* (b) ii) I agree that the growth of support for Sinn Féin in the years 1916-18 was primarily due to the actions of the British government.

Sinn Féin grew numerous supporters following the 1916 Easter rising. At first the sympathy lied in the hands of the British as it was a random attack. However, the British actions in response to the rising was to execute and arrest all Sinn Féiners, when they didn't know who had actually caused the rising. Source 7 states, 'Public opinion had been thoroughly roused by the execution of the major leaders!'

Therefore agreeing that support was grown out of actions of the British Government.

Moreover, the introduction of planned conscription lead to a unity under Sinn

conscription' lead to a unity under sin Féin as they didn't see fighting as an option as many were dying, this plus the opinion that those fighting should volunteer, ^{instead of forced to} increased the support for the party. The actions of the British Government was 'The German Plot'. This insinuated that because they were not fighting, they were

(b) continued in allegiance with Germany. This further lead to the support for sin Féin as any oath to Britain was quickly dismissing. 'Bitter hatred is shown by all classes of people.' Source 8 even goes as far as to include the north in the 'soudly united', proving that the British were clearly adding to the support for Ireland and sin Féin.

On the other hand though sin Féin had being born out of the cultural revival, it was to make Ireland-irish. After this period, many didn't know what the sin Feiners wanted 'vagueness.. helped its unity.' This contradicts the fact it was the British's fault and more the policies the Sin Féin party had in appealing to more than one strand, like Hitler in Germany. This tactic le' almost always increases the electoral vote.

However, I still believe that the British actions and policies following the Easter rising lead to the increased support in the 1918 coupon election where Sinn Féin won 78% of the votes as stated in source 9. Source 9 however,

(b) continued further extends their belief past the British Government actions and states support grew because of a 'rejection' of the old John Redmond party which split after his death in World War 1, after not being united with the beliefs of the one man. This could be a factor, yet as it was half of one party it could not be seen as the primary reason why Sinn Féin grew support, and achieved so many votes. Therefore, after gaining so many votes were able to establish themselves a Irish Government the Dail without British consent.

Overall, I agree that the primary reason Sinn Féin won so many supporters lied in the hands of the British Government. It was a down hill spiral following the aftermath of the Easter rising, Asquith's response to end the executions came too late leaders such as Pearse were ^{already} dead and morale for Britain was diminishing.

and morale for Britain was diminishing especially in the south. This coupled with the conscription crisis only added to the growth of support for *sein fein* and alliance away from Britain: a republic was now on the cards for many.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a strong level 2 answer in both assessment objectives. The response is heavily dependent on information that comes from the sources and the arguments are not well developed. The sources are used as information, with brief quotes extracted from them, rather than as the basis of the argument.

Question 2 (a)

On the whole all of the sources were well understood and examiners saw a number of impressive answers to this question with some candidates seamlessly cross-referencing and commenting on provenance with real acuity. However, in order to reach level 4, it must be remembered that candidates do need to make judgments in relation to the claim in the question, and this was sometimes lacking from otherwise very good answers. There was a slight tendency for candidates to offer more own knowledge than is normally seen; centres are reminded that in part A questions there is no credit for own knowledge.

Some candidates tended to compare and contrast the sources, but not to relate their answers directly to the question.

(a) Taken as a set, sources 10, 11 and 12 disagree with the notion that Lord Curzon's policies in India were ~~are~~ designed to improve the lives of Indians. Sources 11 and 12 most strongly support the idea that Curzon's ~~was~~ policies were merely a means of 'divide and rule' and that the welfare of Indians was not considered. Source ~~10~~ 10 ~~is~~ ^{takes} a more balanced opinion, citing circumstances where Curzon helped Indians, but also talks of his 'Imperial Sentiment'; on balance the sources point toward Curzon's actions and motives as being in the Raj's interests rather than Indians.

A point of similarity between all three sources is that they all cite Curzon's manner and motives as being ~~arrogant~~ ^{contemptuous} toward Indians. Source 10 cites Curzon's "Imperial sentiment" which led him to identify himself as a member of the "dominant race" and Source 12 talks about the Raj's "utter contempt for public opinion" and its "arrogant pretension to superior wisdom." Source 11 agrees with sources 10 and 12 as far as Curzon's motives are concerned, stating he only tried to win favour with the

(a) continued people in order to "prevent any powerful combination between the uneducated middle classes." It is unsurprising that sources 11 and 12 are so critical of Curzon's ~~motives~~ ^{motives} and manner respectively; they were both published by members of Congress (an organisation looking to reduce British presence if not yet get rid of the Raj) and they were both published in 1905, the year of the highly unpopular Bengal partition overseen by Curzon. In a sense these sources are reliable as they reflect the attitudes Indians had toward the Bengal partition, although it must be said the muslim minority welcomed the partition and so may have felt more favourably disposed to Curzon. Even source 10 concedes Curzon was 'not entirely liked' by the Indian people, and this was before the Bengal partition. Source 10 was published by a journalist in India while Curzon was still viceroy so must be examined with caution, however source 10's seemingly balanced approach dispels any accusations of bias and seems to be reliable, but only when examining the actions of Curzon before 1903.

A point of divergence between the sources is their assessment of the extent to which

(a) continued Curzon's policies improved the lives of Indians. Sources 10 and 11 talk about Curzon's "consideration for their welfare" and how Curzon tried to "win the good will of the people," irrespective of true motives for doing so. ~~It~~ In stark contrast for this Source 12 talks about the Raj's "reckless disregard" for the feelings of its subject. However this difference may be explained by the fact that source 12 is mainly referring to the "cruel wrong" of the Bengal partition, while sources 10 and 11 are referring to incidents where Curzon ~~is~~ punished "British soldiers at Rangoon for murdering a native woman" (source 10) and how Curzon reduced "land taxes" and revised the "famine code" (source 11).

In conclusion, taken as a set, while sources 10 and 11 concede that Curzon's policies sometimes helped ~~the~~ Indians, the weight of the evidence goes against the notion that they were 'designed' to do this. Instead Curzon's policies were designed to divide and rule, a notion alluded to by reference to source 10's mention of his 'imperial sentiment' and source 11's reference to him preventing the working classes voting. ~~Overall, sources 11 and 12~~ ^{Overall, sources 11 and 12} most strongly support this hypothesis that

(a) continued Curzon was looking out for British interests, while source 10 implies Curzon had an "open mind." Nevertheless we can ultimately infer from all 3 sources that Curzon's policies were designed to diffuse rather than improve the situation.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a strong level 4 response. In the opening paragraph, the candidate makes clear the direction the answer will take. Some responses use similar words, but do not then go on to deliver; this is not true with this answer. The candidate treats the sources as a set and clearly understands the messages and some of the nuances of the sources. There is sustained cross-referencing and use of provenance and judgements are made throughout.

Question 2 (b) (i)

This was marginally the less popular of the two questions set in this option. Weaker answers tended to take one of two approaches in answering this question: the first approach was

to paraphrase each source in turn with limited supporting own knowledge; the second approach was taken by those who did have some knowledge of the events of the period but who engaged in a narrative of those years with little sense of what was relevant and few links to the focus of the question. It was clear that some events of the period were better known than others. Stronger responses were able to link arguments derived from the sources with valid own knowledge. Such answers were likely to be characterised by their ability to make effective use of Source 15.

It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns no credit in this question. Time spent on this aspect could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

* (b) The Struggle between British imperialism and Indian nationalism often ended with the gradual weakening and giving in of the British. While many of Britain's policies were designed to delay or halt this national movement it can be argued that in fact it sped it up.

Source thirteen says 'Each instalment of reform raised Indian appetites for freedom'. I agree with this statement as such policies as 'the Government of India Act 1919' introduced Dyarchy giving Provincial Powers to the Indians and ~~supplying~~ supplying them with ~~good~~ ^{more} leverage and power with the government. This only hardened the goal for 'Purna Swaraj' or complete independence. Source thirteen goes on to say but these wishes were met with 'blatant repression'.

were met with 'blatant repression' such as the Rowlatt acts of 1919. After its efforts in world war one India sought after more independence from Britain, almost as a reward. The Rowlatt acts

(b) continued which were a direct retaliation of this repressed Indian nationalism with the forcing of martial law, censorship and such laws as 'the crawling order' designed to put down Indians and elevate the British. This consequently led to the slaughtering of ~~the~~ hundreds of Indians in the Amritsar Massacre. This is another example of Britain weakening its hold on India as after this the British were less respected and treated with further suspicion. This is ~~an~~ also an example of the 'Abandonment of the Policy of goodwill and co-operation' as mentioned in source fifteen.

The 1935 Government of India Act mentioned in source ~~the~~ fourteen was created to strengthen Britain's hold on India. Its vastly complex and long policies meant that 'The viceroy contained ultimate control' as he had the power to veto. ~~But in support of~~

~~Source thirteen~~ This led to the 'Nehru Report' were congress

(b) continued wrote a new constitution for an Independent India, strengthening nationalist resolve and putting pressure upon the British Raj to grant 'Purna Swaraj'.

Each installment by Britain was ten or so years too late for the Indian people. Gandhi referred to the Dominion declaration of ~~the~~ 1930 as 'a post dated cheque on a failing bank account', showing that this was no longer enough for the Indian people. Source thirteen says that Britain 'liberalised' India 'grudgingly' and 'with grave reservations'. This suggests that the British are not granting independence but more likely 'giving in' to Indian nationalism. Presenting them as weak and is an example of 'a slow unending retreat from the raj' as mentioned in source fourteen. ~~The declaration in source fifteen shows Britain's~~
In contrast Birkenhead's declaration saying that Britain would not 'abandon

(b) continued 'our trust' shows a tough British dominance in India and its 'exploitation of the country'. Similarly, in the Montague Declaration promising eventual independence just a few years later is equally vague and shows Britain trying to exploit India for as long as it can. It is important to mention that source fifteen is written by a Labour MP who is trying to make the Conservative Party look bad ~~and~~ and fuel nationalist rage.

In Pined analysis British concessions made to the Indians in 1918-39 only strengthened nationalist resolve as it was always granted too late and with not enough power. British attempts to retain power such as the Rowlett acts only made nationalist retaliate and make the British appear weak as a result of it.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response reaches level 3 in both assessment objectives. The response shows clear awareness of what is being discussed in the sources and uses this as the basis of the argument. Reference to evidence from the sources is integrated with a range of relevant, quite detailed own knowledge. Although the response occasionally loses focus, it is sufficiently well sustained to reach a secure Level 3.

Question 2 (b) (ii)

This was marginally the more popular of the two questions set in this option. The sources were generally well understood by candidates, although it was surprising to note that some responses did not make use of them. Candidates were able to consider both the role of Jinnah and of other factors and to weight these appropriately. Most candidates attempting this question demonstrated a basis of own knowledge and it was rare to see an answer that was solely dependent on the material in the sources. There was, in some responses, some confusion about whether Jinnah had always wanted partition. There was also, in some responses, some confusion between independence and partition and therefore responses sometimes included information that was relevant to the former but not the latter. It is disappointing to note that a sizeable minority of candidates continue to discuss the provenance of the secondary sources, normally in very generic terms, which earns them no credit in this question. Time spent on this discussion could be well used to develop the line of argument and incorporate a greater breadth of supporting own knowledge.

Answer EITHER part (b) (i) OR part (b) (ii) of your chosen question.

(ii)

* (b) While it is true that numerous factors contributed toward India's eventual partition in 1947, the most prominent factor was undoubtedly Jinnah's campaign for partition. Evidence from sources 16 and 17 strongly agree with this notion while source 18 places the blame with Mountbatten. Nevertheless, the overwhelming weight of the evidence supports the notion that Jinnah was the primary factor in Indian partition.

Sources 16 and 17 both strongly support the idea that Jinnah was responsible. Source 16, an extract to the Lahore declaration, shows Jinnah stating that partition was "the only cause open to us" and that there were "two nations in India." Source 17 ~~also~~ supports the notion that India could not be "preserved" as a single country, and infers that Jinnah was the reason by the immediate juxtaposition of Jinnah's ~~statement~~ ^{experiences} with Mountbatten to his statement. Source 18, while primarily placing the blame on Mountbatten, also refers to partition as a

"runaway juggernaut" which implies the events leading to partition had occurred before Mountbatten's arrival. Jinnah's demands for Pakistan at Lahore in 1940 is one among several reasons why (b) continued his campaign was responsible for partition. Jinnah's 14 point counter-proposal to the Nehru report of 1928 ~~is~~ arguably marks his divergence from the Hindu dominated Congress. Jinnah exacerbated this divide by refusing to initially participate in the constituent assembly (which was to oversee Indian independence) after Congress' counter-proposal to the May statement of 1946. Furthermore, Jinnah's initial refusal to participate in the interim government of September 1946 also demonstrate his unwillingness to engage in compromise. Even after Congress had given in to his demands for Pakistan in March 1947, Jinnah proposed a further Pakistani 'Land Corridor' at the April conference, ~~is~~ again showing ~~the~~ ^a ~~the~~ single minded desire for partition. Jinnah's call for a universal muslim hartal in 1946 led to the great Calcutta Killings where 6000 were killed, 20 000 wounded and 100 000 made homeless - by this point violence had rendered a unified India an impossibility and Jinnah's prediction of Pakistan in the 1940 Lahore declaration ~~came to be~~ ^{became} inevitable. While source 18 cites Mountbatten and not Jinnah as the reason for partition, it is clear from the book's title - "Shameful Flight" - that the source is a polemic and must be approached with a degree of caution.

(b) continued However the sources also refer to other factors, most specifically the actions of Mountbatten in sources 17 and 18. Source 17 talks about Mountbatten being "brutal with Jinnah" and source 18 talks about Mountbatten lacking "humility" and "good sense" stating he was neither "wise enough" nor "patient enough" to oversee partition of a united India. Furthermore source 18 actually credits Jinnah with trying to "stop the runaway juggernaut of partition." # Mountbatten demanded plenipotentiary powers from Attlee, showing the arrogance alluded to in source 18 and it has been noted that he called Jinnah 'a psychopathic case' which provides evidence for source 17's assertions regarding his rudeness toward Jinnah. Mountbatten's unprofessional proximity to Nehru (he showed him the Balkan plan at a retreat in Simla on May 10 1947) shows Mountbatten's bias and further gives weight to this argument. Furthermore, while source 17 states that "no number of intricate political manoeuvres could have prevented" partition we must consider that the source was published in 1994, when the outcome of partition had already been realized, and so cannot be sure ~~of~~ how certain or inevitable the outcome truly was.

(b) continued Other factors to consider are Nehru and Attlee. Attlee's strict timeline that independence must occur before June 1948 and his reference to Jinnah as 'that Indian fascist' may have explained the situation while Nehru's counterproposal to the May statement of 1946 arguably sparked Jinnah's call for direct action. This was the latest in a long line of Hindu-Muslim antagonism which must be considered. Hinduism and Islam were opposed in India for decades, the formation of the Muslim League in December 1906 and the presence of the Aligarh movement is evidence of these separate political identities. ~~For~~ Nehru's refusal to appoint Muslims to ~~any~~ any positions of note in the 1937 elections is symptomatic of this divide.

In conclusion, on balance the sources support the idea that the actions of Jinnah were the primary factor in causing partition and this assertion is strengthened by historical evidence. While it's true that there were deep rooted divisions between Hindus and Muslims in India long before Jinnah's campaign it was Jinnah's Lahore declaration (1940) and direct action campaign (1946) which made the differences irreconcilable and

(b) continued partition inevitable. Source 17 supports this view while source 18 blames other factors, although analysis of source 18 shows a clear polemic agenda; while the bias of ~~the~~ Attlee and Mountbatten did not make the situation easier, arguably this attitude to Jinnah only arose due to his inability to compromise on Pakistan; which was demonstrated numerous times in Lahore and ~~at~~ Simla conference (1946). ~~Ultimately Jinnah's desire was to see Pakistan before he died.~~



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a strong level 4 response in both assessment objectives. The candidate uses the sources to drive the argument and the sources are integrated with specific and detailed own knowledge to support the analysis which deals with both the argument and counter argument. Even in a strong answer, there can be flaws; most obvious in this response is the discussion of the provenance of the secondary sources which earns no credit and perhaps takes up valuable time.

Paper Summary

Based on performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Part A

1. Candidates should spend sufficient time reading the sources to ensure that they understand the nuances of the arguments presented.
2. Candidates should treat the sources as a package in order to facilitate cross-referencing. Weaker candidates often resorted to a brief summary of each source in turn. Such responses cannot go beyond level 2.
3. Provenance should be integrated within the argument, rather than treated as a stand-alone paragraph. This aids its use as part of the argument. Candidates should avoid making sweeping assertions from the provenance that could apply to any source.
4. The best responses cross-reference not only the content of the sources but also their provenance. This enables candidates to weigh the sources and reach supported judgements.

Part B

1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually relied very heavily on information derived primarily from the sources.
2. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis driven by the arguments raised in the sources, not present a purely descriptive or chronological account.
3. Whilst it may be relevant to use the provenance of the contemporary source(s) to judge the weight that can be assigned to the argument, there is no such requirement for the secondary sources and this is not rewarded in this assessment objective. Some candidates engaged in generalised comments relating to the reliability of a particular historian at the expense of developing argument and analysis supported by specific own knowledge.
4. Candidates need to ensure that where the question asks them to deal with a specific time period they do not stray beyond those parameters.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code US034636 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning